



Developed and published under contract with the Kentucky Department of Education by CTB/McGraw-Hill LLC, a subsidiary of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 20 Ryan Ranch Road, Monterey, California 93940-5703. Copyright © 2004 by the Kentucky Department of Education. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the Kentucky Department of Education.

2003-2004 WRITING PORTFOLIO AUDIT Rationale and Procedures

During June and July 2004, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) conducted an audit of 4th, 7th, and 12th grade Writing Portfolio scores submitted by schools throughout the state. Audits have been a regular part of the Writing Portfolio program since the 1992-93 Audit. As with prior audits, the 2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit was conducted with the express intent to either verify or adjust scores for all portfolios from schools selected for auditing. Final results of the Audit were combined with On-demand Writing scores to calculate the 2003-2004 Writing Index for each audited school.

This document provides detailed information concerning the objectives, procedures, verification, and reporting for the 2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit. Since all Kentucky schools housing grades 4, 7, and 12 were eligible for audit selection, it is important that all superintendents, district assessment coordinators, principals, and other interested school personnel be aware of the objectives, procedures, and potential ramifications of the Writing Portfolio Audit.

OBJECTIVES

The portfolio audit has been designed and conducted to fulfill the following objectives:

- Provide a broad picture of statewide scoring accuracy
- Provide data to inform necessary training
- Encourage schools to attend to the accuracy of their scoring
- Ensure that discrepant scores are adjusted
- Establish an environment where auditing is a regular occurrence within the system

While these purposes and goals are necessary for the accountability system itself, it is important to keep in mind that the audit functions to keep us all focused instructionally on the same standards.

To accomplish all of these objectives, a combination of purposeful and random selection of schools was employed. This type of selection process allows KDE to address the concerns, recommendations, and needs of a variety of audiences (audit participants, Kentucky scoring teachers, district- and school-level administrators, and external review experts) while retaining an environment of equity for all schools.

SELECTION PROCESS

KDE identified schools for auditing using a two-stage selection process. All schools in which accountability portfolios are developed and scores are submitted were eligible for selection. Both of the following selection processes were done by school level (i.e., elementary, middle and high school).

Purposeful Selection

1. A 2003 Academic Index that *excludes* the Writing Portfolio was calculated.
2. Using simple linear regression (SLR), the 2003 Academic Index calculated in (1) and the 2003 Writing Portfolio Index were used to create a prediction formula (the Academic Index was used to predict the value of the Writing Portfolio Index).
3. Schools were rank-ordered based upon the difference between their actual Writing Portfolio scores and their predicted scores.
4. Those schools with the largest difference between their actual Writing Portfolio scores and their predicted scores were selected for the purposeful sample. Note that two-thirds of the schools selected

have Writing Portfolio scores larger than predicted while only one-third of the schools selected have Writing Portfolio scores lower than predicted.

5. Only 20% of students in the Audit were selected purposefully. (The 20% is a target value and may vary slightly from the actual number of Portfolios selected.)

A school can be selected purposefully any year.

Random Selection

After the purposeful selection process was completed, the remaining schools were selected at random. This process ensures that any school may be selected for auditing. Approximately 80% of students in the Audit were selected randomly.

SUBMITTING PORTFOLIOS

After purposeful and random selections of schools were completed, schools were notified of their inclusion in the audit (May 2004). Selected schools shipped to CTB all portfolios for which original scores were assigned. Please note that portfolios scored as Incomplete and/or portfolios scored at an alternative school were not to be delivered to CTB. CTB was responsible for proper care of all portfolios once they were received and until they were shipped back to schools. To protect against damage or loss of portfolios during shipment, audited schools were required to photocopy all portfolios before shipping. Schools are reimbursed by the Kentucky Department of Education for photocopying costs. Reimbursement information and shipping instructions were provided with the audit notification letter.

So that the portfolios that are scored during auditing provide the same evidence as those originally scored by teachers, no photocopies of portfolios were accepted. Please note that student names and other identifiers did not need to be removed from submitted portfolios, as the Audit is a fully confidential and secure procedure.

Should any school have failed to submit any portfolios for which original scores were reported, the Audit score for those portfolios was assigned a value of zero (i.e., Novice Non-Performance).

LOCATION AND SCORING TEAM

The 2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit was conducted in Indianapolis, Indiana, using CTB/McGraw-Hill's professional writing scoring teams. Evaluators were selected from a pool of applicants that regularly score writing assessments. The audit team was comprised of college graduates, including former classroom teachers, educational administrators, writers, editors, retired business people, and other professionals. Evaluators were selected based on their demonstrated level of experience and accuracy. In addition, all evaluators were required to qualify in order to score audit portfolios. This qualifying procedure, discussed below, is the same as that employed when Kentucky teachers participate in large-scale scoring activities.

TRAINING AND SCORING PROCEDURES

Training

The Writing Portfolio Consultants from the Kentucky Department of Education and CTB/McGraw-Hill trained all team leaders and evaluators using the same procedures and materials used to train all scoring teachers in Kentucky during the school year. The training materials used include the same Holistic Scoring Guide and the "Writing Portfolio Scoring: Teacher's Handbook" used by educators scoring portfolios in state. In addition, the CTB Writing Portfolio Supervisors trained team leaders and evaluators in operational and documentation procedures. KDE personnel monitored the auditing session to ensure that the quality of both the scoring accuracy and operational procedures were maintained throughout the entire process.

Scoring

Portfolios were packaged within grade levels. Evaluators were given a stack of ten portfolios and a score sheet to accompany each portfolio. Evaluators carefully read each portfolio. Using their scoring guide and training, they assigned a score for each portfolio.

Once stacks of portfolios were scored, CTB compared the readers' audit scores with the original scores assigned by the school. If these scores agreed, the original score stood as the score of record. If these scores did not agree, the portfolio was scored a second time. After the second audit score was assigned, all three scores (original, first audit, and second audit) were compared. If all three scores differed, the portfolio was scored by a final scorer of record (KDE or CTB Writing Portfolio Supervisor). Any two of the three scores which agreed and did not lower the original school score stood as the score of record. If the final CTB audit score was lower than the original school score, Kentucky Review Readers scored the portfolio for a final score of record*. Kentucky Review Readers are members of the KY Scoring Accuracy and Assurance Team. It is important to note that scorers were not aware of any previously assigned scores (original scores assigned by the schools or scores assigned by other auditors).

Portfolios were assigned a score of Incomplete if they met one of the following conditions: missing pieces, missing content requirement, proven plagiarism, or foreign language entry. In previous years, a score of Incomplete overrode any score assigned in a previous round and only the score of Incomplete was reported. This year, the scores assigned prior to confirmation of a score of Incomplete are also reported.

Due to time constraints, the Kentucky Review Readers did not score approximately 230 of the Grade 7 portfolios that were assigned a final CTB score that was lower than the original score. These portfolios are reported with the final CTB audit score. In October 2004, the Kentucky Review Readers will score these portfolios. The affected schools will receive a list of the student litho codes that were not scored by a Kentucky Review Reader during the audit. After the October review, any necessary score adjustments will be made during the Data Clean-Up phase of the 2004 assessment.

VERIFICATION OF QUALITY RESULTS

Two of the most critical aspects of the auditing process are to ensure that results are reliable and to provide schools with accurate and consistent information. Therefore, a comprehensive verification process is an integral part of the audit. A description of each component in this verification process follows.

Qualifying

Prior to scoring, all evaluators and team leaders must demonstrate a high level of scoring accuracy on sets of portfolios with scores that have been pre-determined by the Kentucky Writing Advisory Committee and/or the Scoring Accuracy Assurance Team (a sub-committee of the Writing Advisory Committee). Those scorers who successfully qualified began scoring. Those scorers who did not successfully qualify were released from scoring obligations.

Recalibration

Every morning prior to any scoring, all evaluators, team leaders and supervisors reviewed the scoring tools.

Consistency Check

CTB/McGraw-Hill's Team leaders read behind 20% of the portfolios in every packet read by evaluators. If scoring discrepancies were noted, discussion and resolution occurred immediately. Scores assigned by both the evaluator and the team leader were documented to check against original scores and to determine the internal level of agreement among scorers (consistency). Kentucky Department of Education Consultants and CTB Writing Portfolio Supervisors when reading behind team leaders conducted this same

consistency check. The results of the 20% Consistency Check were used to verify the overall consistency in scoring demonstrated over the span of the Audit.

Accuracy Check: Quality Control Portfolios

Quality Control Portfolios are portfolios with scores that have been pre-determined by the Writing Advisory Committee and/or the Scoring Accuracy Assurance Team, including portfolios that were used in previous audits and have been reconfigured to meet current portfolio configuration requirements. For the 2004 Audit Review, Quality Control Portfolios were distributed to evaluators for discussion purposes as well as for monitoring scoring accuracy. All evaluators scored and discussed two Quality Control Portfolios per day in order to provide continual retraining to Kentucky standards. In addition, Quality Control Portfolios were placed (or seeded) randomly within stacks of portfolios being scored for the 2004 Audit. These seeded portfolios were not recognizable to evaluators as quality controls and, thus, ensured that evaluators were maintaining standards throughout the scoring process.

A similar procedure for Quality Control was used with the Audit Review Team (Kentucky teachers). At Grades 4 and 12, the scores from the seeded portfolios, discussion set portfolios, and read behinds were averaged on a daily basis. At Grade 7, the discussions set portfolios and read behinds were averaged. If the evaluator maintained the standard of accuracy, the evaluator continued to score. If he or she fell below the standard, the evaluator was dismissed. This assures that consistent standards of accuracy were being applied.

REPORTING PROCEDURES

The following print information will be provided to audited schools:

A comprehensive document including:

- Training and Scoring Procedures
- Audit Results
- Audit Review Results
- Overall Quality Results

Score reports including:

- Student ID (lithocode number)
- Original Score
- Rescore
- 2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Index
- Cross-tabulation Charts
- Performance Level Data

Reports and supporting print materials will be delivered to district assessment coordinators during the fall of 2004. District assessment coordinators will then provide results to audited school personnel.

CHANGES TO THE ACCOUNTABILITY INDEX

When all Audit and Audit Review procedures have been completed, and the results of the Audit have been verified, the scores assigned during the Audit will be used to calculate the Writing Index for all audited schools. All adjustments in scores will be reflected in this index. For example:

School A may submit 150 portfolios. The Audit and Audit Review may demonstrate that it is necessary to adjust scores for only 6 portfolios. School B may submit 60 portfolios, and the Audit and Audit Review may demonstrate that it is necessary to adjust scores for 49 portfolios. While School A has demonstrated a substantially greater level of accuracy than School B, both schools'

individual portfolio scores will be adjusted to reflect the accurate scores assigned for each portfolio during the Audit.

RESULTS

The most detailed presentation of the Audit results is found in the cross-tabulation charts in Appendix L. The cross-tabulations are presented by grade and selection status. Each of these tables breaks down the number of portfolios assigned to each performance level by the original local scoring teams and by the audit scorers. The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores, while the numbers recorded in the vertical column to the right represent the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal area represent scores that were lowered, while numbers below the shaded diagonal represent scores that were raised. School specific data detailing school-level writing portfolio index change appears in Appendix M. School-specific cross-tabulation charts are provided in Appendix N. School-specific student results and score history are provided in Appendix O.

QUESTIONS

For questions regarding the 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit scoring procedures and standards, please contact Cherry Boyles at (502) 564-2106.

For questions regarding 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit data, please contact Roger Ervin at (502) 564-2256.

For general 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit questions and scheduling information, please contact Rhonda Sims at (502) 564-4394.

APPENDICES

Appendix A.....	Summary of Selected Schools
Appendix B.....	Qualifying Results
Appendix C.....	Reading to Resolution
Appendix D.....	Quality Control Results
Appendix E.....	KY Review Readers Quality Control Results
Appendix F.....	School/Audit WPI Comparisons
Appendix G.....	Writing Portfolio Index Changes
Appendix H.....	Writing Portfolio Index Changes Summary
Appendix I.....	Variations across Schools: WPI Changes
Appendix J.....	Exact Agreement Rates
Appendix K.....	Variations Across Schools: Exact Agreement Rates
Appendix L.....	Cross-Tabulation Charts
Appendix M.....	School-Specific Writing Portfolio Index Change
Appendix N.....	School Specific Cross-Tabulation Charts
Appendix O.....	School Specific Student Results/Score History

APPENDIX A
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

SUMMARY OF SELECTED SCHOOLS
Number of Schools and Portfolios Selected for Auditing

	Random		Purposeful		Combined	
	# of schools selected	# of portfolios selected	# of schools selected	# of portfolios selected	# of schools selected	# of portfolios selected
Grade 04	42	2,678	17	674	59	3,352
Grade 07	24	3,288	5	427	29	3,715
Grade 12	9	1,788	4	437	13	2,225
TOTAL	75	7,754	26	1,538	101	9,292

In the 2003-2004 audit, one school had both 4th and 7th grades selected. When totals were calculated individually by grade, 101 schools were in the audit. However, the overall number of individual schools in the audit is 100.

APPENDIX B
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

QUALIFYING RESULTS
 Percentage and Number of Readers Who Qualified

	Audit Evaluators	Audit Team Leader	Kentucky Review Readers
Grade 04	61.53% (8/13)	100.00% (2/2)	100.00% (5/5)
Grade 07	76.92% (10/13)	100.00% (2/2)	100.00% (5/5)
Grade 12	76.92% (10/13)	100.00% (2/2)	100.00% (5/5)
Total	71.79% (28/39)	100.00% (6/6)	100.00% (15/15)

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 1 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading
Grade 4 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	0.62%	0.47%	9.09%	0.00%	0.82%
	(13/2091)	(3/640)	(1/11)	(0/0)	(5/610)
Novice	7.36%	7.03%	0.00%	0.00%	4.75%
	(154/2091)	(45/640)	(0/11)	(0/0)	(29/610)
Apprentice	57.91%	44.53%	45.45%	0.00%	61.15%
	(1211/2091)	(285/640)	(5/11)	(0/0)	(373/610)
Proficient	34.00%	47.81%	45.45%	0.00%	32.46%
	(711/2091)	(306/640)	(5/11)	(0/0)	(198/610)
Distinguished	0.10%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.82%
	(2/2091)	(1/640)	(0/11)	(0/0)	(5/610)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(2091/2091)	(640/640)	(11/11)	(0/0)	(610/610)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 2 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 4 Random

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	0.72%	0.58%	10.00%	0.00%	0.83%
	(12/1672)	(3/514)	(1/10)	(0/0)	(4/482)
Novice	5.32%	6.61%	0.00%	0.00%	4.77%
	(89/1672)	(34/514)	(0/10)	(0/0)	(23/482)
Apprentice	64.95%	47.28%	50.00%	0.00%	59.13%
	(1086/1672)	(243/514)	(5/10)	(0/0)	(285/482)
Proficient	28.89%	45.33%	40.00%	0.00%	34.44%
	(483/1672)	(233/514)	(4/10)	(0/0)	(166/482)
Distinguished	0.12%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.83%
	(2/1672)	(1/514)	(0/10)	(0/0)	(4/482)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(1672/1672)	(514/514)	(10/10)	(0/0)	(482/482)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 3 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 4 Purposeful

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.78%
	(1/419)	(0/126)	(0/1)	(0/0)	(1/128)
Novice	15.51%	8.73%	0.00%	0.00%	4.69%
	(65/419)	(11/126)	(0/1)	(0/0)	(6/128)
Apprentice	29.83%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	68.75%
	(125/419)	(42/126)	(0/1)	(0/0)	(88/128)
Proficient	54.42%	57.94%	100.00%	0.00%	25.00%
	(228/419)	(73/126)	(1/1)	(0/0)	(32/128)
Distinguished	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.78%
	(0/419)	(0/126)	(0/1)	(0/0)	(1/128)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(419/419)	(126/126)	(1/1)	(0/0)	(128/128)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 4 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 7 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	1.32%	0.25%	0.00%	0.00%	1.14%
	(26/1968)	(2/787)	(0/253)	(0/4)	(8/703)
Novice	40.65%	6.86%	88.93%	100.00%	43.95%
	(800/1968)	(54/787)	(225/253)	(4/4)	(309/703)
Apprentice	45.43%	64.29%	7.11%	0.00%	40.11%
	(894/1968)	(506/787)	(18/253)	(0/4)	(282/703)
Proficient	11.99%	27.83%	3.95%	0.00%	14.08%
	(236/1968)	(219/787)	(10/253)	(0/4)	(99/703)
Distinguished	0.61%	0.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.71%
	(12/1968)	(6/787)	(0/253)	(0/4)	(5/703)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	(1968/1968)	(787/787)	(253/253)	(4/4)	(703/703)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

Due to time constraints, the Kentucky Review Readers did not score approximately 230 Grade 7 portfolios that were assigned a final CTB score which was lower than the original school score. These portfolios are reported with the final CTB audit score. In October 2004, the Kentucky Review Readers will score these portfolios. Schools included in the October review will receive a list of the student litho codes that were not scored by a Kentucky Review Reader during the audit. After the October review, any necessary score adjustments will be made during the Data Clean-Up phase of the 2004 assessment.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 5 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 7 Random

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	1.45%	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%	1.11%
	(25/1720)	(2/682)	(0/249)	(0/4)	(7/633)
Novice	42.38%	6.60%	90.36%	100.00%	46.76%
	(729/1720)	(45/682)	(225/249)	(4/4)	(296/633)
Apprentice	43.90%	65.98%	6.43%	0.00%	39.97%
	(755/1720)	(450/682)	(16/249)	(0/4)	(253/633)
Proficient	11.74%	26.39%	3.21%	0.00%	11.69%
	(202/1720)	(180/682)	(8/249)	(0/4)	(74/633)
Distinguished	0.52%	0.73%	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%
	(9/1720)	(5/682)	(0/249)	(0/4)	(3/633)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	(1720/1720)	(682/682)	(249/249)	(4/4)	(633/633)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

Due to time constraints, the Kentucky Review Readers did not score approximately 230 Grade 7 portfolios that were assigned a final CTB score which was lower than the original school score. These portfolios are reported with the final CTB audit score. In October 2004, the Kentucky Review Readers will score these portfolios. Schools included in the October review will receive a list of the student litho codes that were not scored by a Kentucky Review Reader during the audit. After the October review, any necessary score adjustments will be made during the Data Clean-Up phase of the 2004 assessment.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 6 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 7 Purposeful

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%
	(1/248)	(0/105)	(0/4)	(0/0)	(1/70)
Novice	28.63%	8.57%	0.00%	0.00%	18.57%
	(71/248)	(9/105)	(0/4)	(0/0)	(13/70)
Apprentice	56.05%	53.33%	50.00%	0.00%	41.43%
	(139/248)	(56/105)	(2/4)	(0/0)	(29/70)
Proficient	13.71%	37.14%	50.00%	0.00%	35.71%
	(34/248)	(39/105)	(2/4)	(0/0)	(25/70)
Distinguished	1.21%	0.95%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%
	(3/248)	(1/105)	(0/4)	(0/0)	(2/70)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(248/248)	(105/105)	(4/4)	(0/0)	(70/70)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 7 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 12 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	1.89%	0.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%
	(20/1057)	(2/368)	(0/19)	(0/0)	(1/781)
Novice	20.15%	9.24%	0.00%	0.00%	36.24%
	(213/1057)	(34/368)	(0/19)	(0/0)	(283/781)
Apprentice	58.18%	63.59%	21.05%	0.00%	54.29%
	(615/1057)	(234/368)	(4/19)	(0/0)	(424/781)
Proficient	19.49%	26.36%	63.16%	0.00%	8.45%
	(206/1057)	(97/368)	(12/19)	(0/0)	(66/781)
Distinguished	0.28%	0.27%	15.79%	0.00%	0.90%
	(3/1057)	(1/368)	(3/19)	(0/0)	(7/781)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(1057/1057)	(368/368)	(19/19)	(0/0)	(781/781)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 8 of 9)
 Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 12 Random

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	1.85%	0.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.16%
	(16/867)	(2/300)	(0/10)	(0/0)	(1/611)
Novice	18.92%	7.00%	0.00%	0.00%	35.35%
	(164/867)	(21/300)	(0/10)	(0/0)	(216/611)
Apprentice	57.90%	66.33%	40.00%	0.00%	55.48%
	(502/867)	(199/300)	(4/10)	(0/0)	(339/611)
Proficient	21.11%	25.67%	40.00%	0.00%	8.18%
	(183/867)	(77/300)	(4/10)	(0/0)	(50/611)
Distinguished	0.23%	0.33%	20.00%	0.00%	0.82%
	(2/867)	(1/300)	(2/10)	(0/0)	(5/611)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(867/867)	(300/300)	(10/10)	(0/0)	(611/611)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX C
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

READING TO RESOLUTION (Page 9 of 9)
Percentage and Number of Portfolios Resolved Per Reading

Grade 12 Purposeful

	Audit Round 1	Audit Round 2	Audit Round 3	Audit Round 4	KY REVIEW*
Incomplete	2.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	(4/190)	(0/68)	(0/9)	(0/0)	(0/170)
Novice	25.79%	19.12%	0.00%	0.00%	39.41%
	(49/190)	(13/68)	(0/9)	(0/0)	(67/170)
Apprentice	59.47%	51.47%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
	(113/190)	(35/68)	(0/9)	(0/0)	(85/170)
Proficient	12.11%	29.41%	88.89%	0.00%	9.41%
	(23/190)	(20/68)	(8/9)	(0/0)	(16/170)
Distinguished	0.53%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%	1.18%
	(1/190)	(0/68)	(1/9)	(0/0)	(2/170)
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	(190/190)	(68/68)	(9/9)	(0/0)	(170/170)

Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

* Portfolios were read to resolution during the Kentucky Review.

APPENDIX D

2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

AUDIT QUALITY CONTROL RESULTS

Percentage and Number of Portfolios in Exact Agreement

	Scorers to Validity Portfolios (Accuracy to Standards)	Scorers to Team Leaders (Read Behind - Consistency with Team)	Team Leaders to Scoring Directors (Read Behind - Consistency with Team)
Grade 04	80.87%	93.09%	94.83%
	(630/779)	(1200/1289)	(147/155)
Grade 07	71.98%	98.63%	97.97%
	(609/846)	(721/731)	(145/148)
Grade 12	70.68%	94.04%	85.78%
	(533/754)	(663/705)	(169/197)
Total	74.49%	94.82%	92.20%
	(1772/2379)	(2584/2725)	(461/500)

All readers were required to maintain a 75% combined agreement rate with their team leaders' read-behinds and the validity portfolios.

Validity Portfolios: To monitor and maintain scoring accuracy to Kentucky standards, pre-identified validity portfolios were placed (or seeded) randomly within stacks of portfolios being scored for the 2004 Audit. Each stack of ten portfolios contained one seeded validity portfolio. Although the above data reflects the results of only the seeded portfolios, readers also scored and discussed two additional validity portfolios each day.

Read-behinds: To measure the consistency of scoring, CTB/McGraw Hill's team leaders randomly chose and read behind 20% of the portfolios in each packet that the readers scored. Likewise, the Scoring Directors independently scored 20% of the portfolios read by the team leaders.

To put these figures into perspective, it is worth noting that many state departments of education require that professional testing contractors demonstrate internal agreement rates of 70% when employing a four-point holistic scoring model such as used with Kentucky writing portfolios.

See pages 3-4, "Verification of Quality Results," for a description of these quality control procedures.

APPENDIX E
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

KY REVIEW READERS QUALITY CONTROL RESULTS
Percentage and Number of Portfolios in Exact Agreement

	KY Review Readers to Validity Portfolios (Accuracy to Standards)	KY Review Readers to Scoring Directors (Read Behind - Consistency with Team)
Grade 04	89.50% (94/105)	90.66% (68/75)
Grade 07	89.10% (90/101)	89.74% (70/78)
Grade 12	82.60% (100/121)	89.74% (70/78)
Total	86.85% (284/327)	90.04% (208/231)

All readers were required to maintain a 75% combined agreement rate with their team leaders' read-behinds and the validity portfolios.

Validity Portfolios: To monitor and maintain scoring accuracy to Kentucky standards, pre-identified validity portfolios were placed (or seeded) randomly within stacks of portfolios being scored for the 2004 Audit. Each stack of ten portfolios contained one seeded validity portfolio. Although the above data reflects the results of only the seeded portfolios, readers also scored and discussed two additional validity portfolios each day.

Read-behinds: To measure the consistency of scoring, KDE scoring directors randomly chose and read behind 10% of the portfolios in each packet that the Kentucky Review Readers scored.

To put these figures into perspective, it is worth noting that many state departments of education require that professional testing contractors demonstrate internal agreement rates of 70% when employing a four-point holistic scoring model such as used with Kentucky writing portfolios.

See pages 3-4, "Verification of Quality Results," for a description of these quality control procedures.

APPENDIX F
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

SCHOOL/AUDIT
 WRITING PORTFOLIO COMPARISONS (page 1 of 2)

	Original WPI: School-Submitted Scores	Final Audit WPI: Final Audit Scores
Grade 04	76.36	71.17
Grade 07	59.08	48.38
Grade 12	69.60	55.53
Total	67.85	58.31

This index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D.

These comparisons are based on the calculations of grade-specific Writing Portfolio Indices for the portfolios that were scored during the audit process. The final score for a portfolio could be reached in two ways. Portfolios that received a higher score or score that matched the original score submitted by the school were considered the final score. Portfolios that received a lower score than the original score submitted by the school were sent to the KY Review Readers for a final score. The table is based on:

- School submitted scores (Original Writing Portfolio Index)
- Final Audit scores (Audit Writing Portfolio Index)

APPENDIX F
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

SCHOOL/AUDIT/REVIEW
 WRITING PORTFOLIO COMPARISONS (page 2 of 2)

Exact Agreement Rates by Performance Level
 Based on the Portfolios
 Read by the KY Review Readers

KY Review Readers and Audit Scorers					
	Novice	Apprentice	Proficient	Distinguished	Total
Grade 04	71.79% (28/39)	76.06% (359/472)	90.91% (90/99)	0.00% (0/0)	78.20% (477/610)
Grade 07	84.82% (285/336)	73.02% (230/315)	76.92% (40/52)	0.00% (0/0)	78.95% (555/703)
Grade 12	81.98% (273/333)	88.14% (364/413)	85.71% (30/35)	0.00% (0/0)	85.40% (667/781)
Total	82.77% (586/708)	79.42% (953/1200)	86.02% (160/186)	0.00% (0/0)	81.14% (1699/2094)

These comparisons are based on the calculations of grade-specific Writing Portfolio Indices for the portfolios that received lowered scores during the audit process. Lowered scores were sent to a KY Review Reader for final score.

See page 3-4, "Accuracy Check: Audit Review," for a description of the audit review process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 01 of 12)
 Grade 4, 7 and 12 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	81	0.87%	0
N	1,406	15.13%	13	N	2,150	23.14%	13
A	4,675	50.31%	60	A	4,851	52.21%	60
P	2,949	31.74%	100	P	2,165	23.30%	100
D	262	2.82%	140	D	45	0.48%	140
Total	9,292	100.00%		Total	9,292	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	67.85
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	58.31
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-9.54

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 02 of 12)
 Grade 4, 7 and 12 Random

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	73	0.94%	0
N	1,167	15.05%	13	N	1,846	23.81%	13
A	4,067	52.45%	60	A	4,137	53.35%	60
P	2,317	29.88%	100	P	1,664	21.46%	100
D	203	2.62%	140	D	34	0.44%	140
Total	7,754	100.00%		Total	7,754	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	66.98
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	57.19
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-9.79

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 03 of 12)
 Grade 4, 7 and 12 Purposeful

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	8	0.52%	0
N	239	15.54%	13	N	304	19.77%	13
A	608	39.53%	60	A	714	46.42%	60
P	632	41.09%	100	P	501	32.57%	100
D	59	3.84%	140	D	11	0.72%	140
Total	1,538	100.00%		Total	1,538	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	72.21
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	64.00
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-8.21

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 04 of 12)
 Grade 4 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	22	0.66%	0
N	246	7.34%	13	N	228	6.80%	13
A	1,571	46.87%	60	A	1,874	55.91%	60
P	1,409	42.03%	100	P	1,220	36.40%	100
D	126	3.76%	140	D	8	0.24%	140
Total	3,352	100.00%		Total	3,352	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	76.36
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	71.17
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-5.19

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 05 of 12)
 Grade 4 Random

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	20	0.75%	0
N	161	6.01%	13	N	146	5.45%	13
A	1,389	51.87%	60	A	1,619	60.46%	60
P	1,029	38.42%	100	P	886	33.08%	100
D	99	3.70%	140	D	7	0.26%	140
Total	2,678	100.00%		Total	2,678	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	75.50
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	70.43
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-5.07

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 06 of 12)
 Grade 4 Purposeful

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	2	0.30%	0
N	85	12.61%	13	N	82	12.17%	13
A	182	27.00%	60	A	255	37.83%	60
P	380	56.38%	100	P	334	49.55%	100
D	27	4.01%	140	D	1	0.15%	140
Total	674	100.00%		Total	674	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	79.83
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	74.04
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-5.79

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 07 of 12)
 Grade 7 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	36	0.97%	0
N	886	23.85%	13	N	1,392	37.47%	13
A	1,956	52.65%	60	A	1,700	45.76%	60
P	790	21.27%	100	P	564	15.18%	100
D	83	2.23%	140	D	23	0.62%	140
Total	3,715	100.00%		Total	3,715	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	59.08
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	48.38
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-10.70

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 08 of 12)
 Grade 7 Random

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	34	1.03%	0
N	798	24.27%	13	N	1,299	39.51%	13
A	1,745	53.07%	60	A	1,474	44.83%	60
P	681	20.71%	100	P	464	14.11%	100
D	64	1.95%	140	D	17	0.52%	140
Total	3,288	100.00%		Total	3,288	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	58.44
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	46.88
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-11.56

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 09 of 12)
 Grade 7 Purposeful

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	2	0.47%	0
N	88	20.61%	13	N	93	21.78%	13
A	211	49.41%	60	A	226	52.93%	60
P	109	25.53%	100	P	100	23.42%	100
D	19	4.45%	140	D	6	1.41%	140
Total	427	100.00%		Total	427	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	64.09
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	59.98
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-4.11

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 10 of 12)
 Grade 12 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	23	1.03%	0
N	274	12.31%	13	N	530	23.82%	13
A	1,148	51.60%	60	A	1,277	57.39%	60
P	750	33.71%	100	P	381	17.12%	100
D	53	2.38%	140	D	14	0.63%	140
Total	2,225	100.00%		Total	2,225	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	69.60
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	55.53
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-14.07

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 11 of 12)
 Grade 12 Random

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	19	1.06%	0
N	208	11.63%	13	N	401	22.43%	13
A	933	52.18%	60	A	1,044	58.39%	60
P	607	33.95%	100	P	314	17.56%	100
D	40	2.24%	140	D	10	0.56%	140
Total	1,788	100.00%		Total	1,788	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	69.91
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	56.29
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-13.62

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX G
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results
 WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES (Page 12 of 12)
 Grade 12 Purposeful

ORIGINAL WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX				REVISED WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX			
Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting	Score	Number	Percent	Index Weighting
I*			0	I*	4	0.92%	0
N	66	15.10%	13	N	129	29.52%	13
A	215	49.20%	60	A	233	53.32%	60
P	143	32.72%	100	P	67	15.33%	100
D	13	2.97%	140	D	4	0.92%	140
Total	437	100.00%		Total	437	100.00%	

Original Writing Portfolio Index	68.36
Revised Writing Portfolio Index	52.45
Total Change (Revised - Original)	-15.91

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX H

2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES SUMMARY FROM APPENDIX G

Revised Writing Portfolio Index-Original Writing Portfolio Index

	Random	Purposeful	Combined
Grade 04	-5.07 (70.43-75.50)	-5.79 (74.04-79.83)	-5.19 (71.17-76.36)
Grade 07	-11.56 (46.88-58.44)	-4.11 (59.98-64.09)	-10.70 (48.38-59.08)
Grade 12	-13.62 (56.29-69.91)	-15.91 (52.45-68.36)	-14.07 (55.53-69.60)
TOTAL	-9.79 (57.19-66.98)	-8.21 (64.00-72.21)	-9.54 (58.31-67.85)

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change*

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals } 11.4 \% \text{ of Accountability Index})}{2 \text{ (years per biennium)}}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

APPENDIX I

2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

VARIATIONS ACROSS SCHOOLS: WRITING PORTFOLIO INDEX CHANGES

0 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index raised 20.01 or more

1 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index raised 10.01 to 20.00

8 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index raised 0.01 to 10.00

4 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index unchanged

56 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index lowered 0.01 to 10.00

25 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index lowered 10.01 to 20.00

7 school(s) had their Writing Portfolio Index lowered 20.01 or more

The index is a 140-point scale based upon the weights applied to N, A, P, D. See pages 5-6, "Changes to Accountability Index," for a discussion of writing portfolio index adjustments.

These data are calculated using:

- **Original Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the writing portfolio scores originally reported by local scorers.
- **Revised Writing Portfolio Index**
Based on the revised writing portfolio scores from the audit.
- **Total Writing Portfolio Index Change**
The difference between the Original Writing Portfolio Index and the Revised Writing Portfolio Index.

Calculating the impact of total Writing Portfolio Index change*

- The Writing Portfolio Index accounts for 11.4% of a school's Accountability Index.
- The Accountability Index is calculated on a biennium basis.
- Therefore, a 10-point decrease in one year's Writing Portfolio Index would translate to a .57 reduction to a school's Accountability Index.
- Use the following blank formula to calculate the impact of your school's total Writing Portfolio Index change:

$$\frac{(\text{Writing Portfolio Index Change}) \times .114 (\text{The WPI equals 11.4 \% of Accountability Index})}{2 (\text{years per biennium})}$$

Note that this formula holds true only for schools administering the CTBS in grades 3 (end of primary), 6, or 9. For schools that do not have an NRT, the weight is 12% (.12).

APPENDIX J
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

EXACT AGREEMENT RATES (page 1 of 2)

Percentage of Exact Agreement Between
Original and Final Audit Scores
by School Type

	Random	Purposeful	Combined
Grade 04	81.78%	79.23%	81.26%
Grade 07	74.33%	85.95%	75.67%
Grade 12	66.50%	63.39%	65.89%
Total	75.10%	76.59%	75.34%

To put these figures into perspective, it is worth noting that many state departments of education require that professional testing contractors demonstrate internal agreement rates of 70% when employing a four-point holistic scoring model such as is used with Kentucky writing portfolios.

See page 5, "Results", for a discussion of the results of the audit.

APPENDIX J
2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

EXACT AGREEMENT RATES (page 2 of 2)
Exact Agreement Rates between
Original and Final Audit Scores
by Performance Level

	Novice	Apprentice	Proficient	Distinguished
Grade 04	80.89% (199/246)	93.32% (1466/1571)	74.59% (1051/1409)	6.35% (8/126)
Grade 07	96.39% (854/886)	73.26% (1433/1956)	63.54% (502/790)	26.51% (22/83)
Grade 12	90.15% (247/274)	76.31% (876/1148)	44.00% (330/750)	24.53% (13/53)
Total	92.46% (1300/1406)	80.75% (3775/4675)	63.85% (1883/2949)	16.41% (43/262)

See page 5, "Results," for a discussion of the results of the audit.

APPENDIX K

2003 - 2004 Writing Portfolio Audit Results

VARIATIONS ACROSS SCHOOLS: EXACT AGREEMENT RATES

Percentage of Exact Agreement Between Original and Final Audit Scores

16 school(s) had an exact agreement rate of 90.00% or higher

37 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 80.00%-89.99%

28 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 70.00%-79.99%

10 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 60.00%-69.99%

8 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 50.00%-59.99%

0 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 40.00%-49.99%

1 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 30.00%-39.99%

1 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 20.00%-29.99%

0 school(s) had an exact agreement rate 10.00%-19.99%

To put these figures into perspective, it is worth noting that many state departments of education require that professional testing contractors demonstrate internal agreement rates of 70% when employing a four-point holistic scoring model such as is used with Kentucky writing portfolios.

See page 5, "Results," for a discussion of the results of the audit.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 01 of 12)

Grades 4, 7, and 12 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	18	37	24	2	81	Audit Scores
	N	0	1300	761	89	0	2150	
	A	0	87	3775	951	38	4851	
	P	0	1	102	1883	179	2165	
	D	0	0	0	2	43	45	
	Original Total	0	1406	4675	2949	262	9292	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 75.34%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 02 of 12)

Grades 4, 7, and 12 Random

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	16	33	22	2	73	Audit Scores
	N	0	1082	688	76	0	1846	
	A	0	68	3266	774	29	4137	
	P	0	1	80	1443	140	1664	
	D	0	0	0	2	32	34	
	Original Total	0	1167	4067	2317	203	7754	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 75.10%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 03 of 12)

Grades 4, 7, and 12 Purposeful

		Original Scores							
		I	N	A	P	D	Audit Total		
Audit Scores	I*	0	2	4	2	0	8	Audit Scores	
	N	0	218	73	13	0	304		
	A	0	19	509	177	9	714		
	P	0	0	22	440	39	501		
	D	0	0	0	0	11	11		
	Original Total	0	239	608	632	59	1538		
		Original Scores							

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 76.59%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 04 of 12)

Grade 4 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	3	8	10	1	22	Audit Scores
	N	0	199	27	2	0	228	
	A	0	43	1466	346	19	1874	
	P	0	1	70	1051	98	1220	
	D	0	0	0	0	8	8	
	Original Total	0	246	1571	1409	126	3352	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 81.26%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 05 of 12)

Grade 4 Random

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	3	7	9	1	20	Audit Scores
	N	0	123	21	2	0	146	
	A	0	34	1307	265	13	1619	
	P	0	1	54	753	78	886	
	D	0	0	0	0	7	7	
	Original Total	0	161	1389	1029	99	2678	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 81.78%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 06 of 12)

Grade 4 Purposeful

		Original Scores							
		I	N	A	P	D	Audit Total		
Audit Scores	I*	0	0	1	1	0	2	Audit Scores	
	N	0	76	6	0	0	82		
	A	0	9	159	81	6	255		
	P	0	0	16	298	20	334		
	D	0	0	0	0	1	1		
	Original Total	0	85	182	380	27	674		
		Original Scores							

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 79.23%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 07 of 12)

Grade 7 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	11	17	7	1	36	Audit Scores
	N	0	854	490	48	0	1392	
	A	0	21	1433	232	14	1700	
	P	0	0	16	502	46	564	
	D	0	0	0	1	22	23	
	Original Total	0	886	1956	790	83	3715	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 75.67%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 08 of 12)

Grade 7 Random

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	11	16	6	1	34	Audit Scores
	N	0	774	479	46	0	1299	
	A	0	13	1238	212	11	1474	
	P	0	0	12	416	36	464	
	D	0	0	0	1	16	17	
	Original Total	0	798	1745	681	64	3288	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 74.33%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 09 of 12)

Grade 7 Purposeful

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	0	1	1	0	2	Audit Scores
	N	0	80	11	2	0	93	
	A	0	8	195	20	3	226	
	P	0	0	4	86	10	100	
	D	0	0	0	0	6	6	
	Original Total	0	88	211	109	19	427	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 85.95%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 10 of 12)

Grade 12 Combined (Random and Purposeful)

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	4	12	7	0	23	Audit Scores
	N	0	247	244	39	0	530	
	A	0	23	876	373	5	1277	
	P	0	0	16	330	35	381	
	D	0	0	0	1	13	14	
	Original Total	0	274	1148	750	53	2225	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 65.89%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 11 of 12)

Grade 12 Random

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	2	10	7	0	19	Audit Scores
	N	0	185	188	28	0	401	
	A	0	21	721	297	5	1044	
	P	0	0	14	274	26	314	
	D	0	0	0	1	9	10	
	Original Total	0	208	933	607	40	1788	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 66.50%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, "Results" for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.

APPENDIX L

2003-2004 Writing Portfolio Audit

CROSS-TABULATION CHART (page 12 of 12)

Grade 12 Purposeful

		Original Scores					Audit Total	
		I	N	A	P	D		
Audit Scores	I*	0	2	2	0	0	4	Audit Scores
	N	0	62	56	11	0	129	
	A	0	2	155	76	0	233	
	P	0	0	2	56	9	67	
	D	0	0	0	0	4	4	
	Original Total	0	66	215	143	13	437	
		Original Scores						

Percentage of Exact Agreement between Original and Audit Scores: 63.39%

Legend:

I= Incomplete, N= Novice, A= Apprentice, P= Proficient, D= Distinguished

Note: The numbers recorded horizontally at the bottom of the chart represent the original scores while the vertical column to the right represents the audit scores. The gray diagonal area represents scores agreed upon at the audit. In the central, heavily outlined box, the numbers above the diagonal represent scores that were lowered, while the numbers below represent scores that were raised.

See page 5, “Results” for a discussion of the results of the audit.

*Portfolios scored as Incomplete by schools were not delivered to CTB for inclusion in the audit. However, a portfolio could be scored as Incomplete during the Audit scoring process.